

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

SAMUEL RENE LOPEZ,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

TERESSE IAELA-TOKUGAWA, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00876-APG-NJK

**ORDER**

[Docket Nos. 33, 34, 35]

When a plaintiff seeks to proceed with a lawsuit without paying the filing fee, his pleadings are subject to a required judicial screening. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). Plaintiff has previously filed two lengthy complaints that were dismissed without prejudice and, on March 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed a second amended complaint. Docket No. 31. Plaintiff has already been advised in this case as follows:

Plaintiff is advised that the judges assigned to this case are also assigned to hundreds of other civil cases, in addition to myriad criminal cases and criminal duty responsibilities (which take priority over civil cases). Absent unusual circumstances not present here, the Court does not have the luxury of ignoring its other duties to other cases to prioritize one civil case. *Cf. Mazzeo v. Gibbons*, 2010 WL 3020021, at \*1 (D. Nev. July 27, 2010). Indeed, Plaintiff has already been informed that: “the Court will screen your complaint and issue a separate screening order in the future. The Court may issue a screening order several months after you submit your complaint.” Docket No. 7 at 2 (emphasis added); *see also* Docket No. 16 (same).

Docket No. 27 at 1.

Apparently unhappy with the speed of screening his most recent amended complaint, Plaintiff has refiled effectively the same motions that were denied the last time around. *See* Docket No. 33 (motion for summons); Docket No. 34 (motion for service); Docket No. 35 (motion for expedited hearing and expedited trial). As the Court did previously, the Court construes these

1 motions as seeking issuance of an order screening the second amended complaint.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons  
2 already explained, these pending motions are **DENIED**. Docket Nos. 33, 34, 35. The Court will  
3 issue a further screening order as to the second amended complaint, as well as any other order  
4 necessitated by the result of that screening order, in due course.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: May 6, 2025

7  
8   
9 \_\_\_\_\_  
10 Nancy J. Koppe  
11 United States Magistrate Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S.  
89, 94 (2007).